1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
10	Plaintiff,) 2:11-CR-245-RCJ (GWF)
11	V.)
12))
13	MARKEITH BRANSCUMB,
14	Defendant.)
15	
16	United States' Motion To Amend Judgment
17	Background and Facts
18	COMES NOW the United States of America, by and through the United States Attorney
19	for the District of Nevada, and moves this Court, pursuant to Rule 36, Fed. R. Crim. P., to amend
20	the order of Judgment and Commitment that this court entered in the above-captioned case on
21	March 22, 2012. Docket #30, #31.
22	In this case, the defendant was indicted for unlawful possession of a firearm, in violation
23	of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) and pled guilty to that charge on October 12, 2011. #1, #20.
24	After defendant's change of plea, this Court entered a Preliminary Order of Forfeiture on
25	December 13, 2011, in which Court found, pursuant to Fed R. Crim P. 32.2(b)(1) and (2), that
26	the United States of America had shown the requisite nexus between the property set forth in the

Forfeiture Allegation of the Criminal Indictment and the offense to which defendant Markeith Branscumb pled guilty. The Preliminary Order forfeited firearms possessed by the defendant. #22.

Defendant's sentencing hearing was held on March 6, 2012. Typically, during the course of a sentencing hearing, Government counsel will request, or the Court will declare, *sua sponte*, that the forfeiture order will be appended to, and made a part of, the signed Judgment and Commitment. This practice is consistent with the mandate of Rule 32.2 (b)(4)(B), Fed. R. Crim. P., which states that the Court "must also include the forfeiture order, directly or by reference, in the judgment, but the Court's failure to do so may be corrected at any time under Rule 36." While it was (and is) the intent of the Government that this Court make the final order of forfeiture a part of the Judgment and Commitment, apparently no such statement of incorporation was made at the sentencing by the Court or counsel.

After the sentencing hearing that was held on March 6, 2012, defendant's counsel consented to, and the Government filed, a (proposed) Final Order of Forfeiture, which this Court signed and entered on March 28, 2012. #33.

The straightforward provisions of Rule 36, Fed. R. Crim. P., provide that: "After giving any notice it considers appropriate, the court may <u>at any time</u> correct a clerical error in a judgment, order or other part of the record, or correct an error in the record arising from oversight or omission." (emphasis added).¹

That it was this Court's intent to impose a forfeiture sanction against the defendant is apparent from its execution of the Preliminary Order of Forfeiture (#22) several months prior to the sentencing hearing. However, to give that independent order the force and

¹Consistent with standard practice, the United States will serve defendant's counsel with a copy of this motion to satisfy the notice requirement embodied in Rule 36.

effect of a judgment, the Final Order of Forfeiture (#33) should, as Rule 32.2 requires, be incorporated by reference, as well as by physical attachment, to the Judgment and Commitment form.

In addition, at the bottom of the "Schedule of Payments" page of the Judgement and Commitment, we request that this Court check the box that denotes the following language: "The defendant shall forfeit the defendant's interest in the following property to the United States:" Underneath that checked box we request that the following language be included:

"See attached Final Order of Forfeiture"

Because Rule 36 gives this Court expansive authority to correct a clerical error or oversight; because it was the intent of this Court and the Government that the defendant forfeit the firearms involved in this lawsuit; and because it will serve the ends of justice to make a correction to the Judgment and Commitment, as described above, that complies with the requirements of Rule 36, the United States requests that the Judgment and Commitment be modified accordingly and that a copy of the Final Order of Forfeiture be appended thereto.

WHEREFORE, the United States requests that its motion, in its entirety, be granted.

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED.

KOBERT C. JONES

Chief Judge

Dated: This 23rd day of April, 2012.